REMARKS

[0003]   Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 22-42 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 22, 29 and 36. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 1-21. New claims added herein are none.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005]   The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on November 8, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application. During the interview, the Examiner quickly and readily agreed that the cited reference did not disclose the claim language in our proposed amendments.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0006]   If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative

Serial No.: 10/606,591   13
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: E. John Fain
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee&hayes   The Business of IP™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0007]   Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0008]   Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends all remaining independent claims 22, 29 and 36 herein.

Serial No.: 10/606,591   14
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: E. John Fain
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee&hayes   The Business of IP™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under §§ 102 and 103

[0009]   Claims 22-25, 28-32, 35-39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and claims 26, 27, 33, 34, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Overview of the Application

[0010]   In the context of a multiple-user computing environment, the Application describes a configuration that allows for a plurality of separate and concurrent desktops and workspaces within the shared computing environment. The Application further describes establishing a separate user environment associated with each desktop and launching a separate user shell associated with each desktop. The list of desktop threads allows for the selective switching from a first desktop to a second desktop without terminating a desktop thread associated with the first desktop. It is also possible to provide a plurality of separate and concurrent environments within the shared computing environment by switching remote processes.

Cited References

[0011]   The Examiner cites ***Unix Unleashed***: "UNIX" as the primary references in the anticipation and obviousness-based rejections. ***Unix Unleashed*** is a book that describes the UNIX operating system.

Serial No.: 10/606,591   15
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: E. John Fain
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee&hayes   The Business of IP™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

Anticipation Rejections

Based upon Unix Unleashed

[0012]   The Examiner rejects claims 22-25, 28-32, 35-39 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Unix Unleashed. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims.   Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0013]   Amended independent claim 22 recites a method comprising [emphasis added]:

> configuring a **single computer with a single user interface display** to be concurrently and physically shared by multiple users by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer, comprising:
>
> ...
>
> **displaying on the single user interface display of the single computer only one of the remote process enabled workspace environments as active at a time**; and ...

[0014]   In the rejection to the claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by UNIX Unleashed. Applicant respectfully submits that UNIX Unleashed fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim. During the above mentioned Examiner interview, the Examiner quickly and readily agreed that the cited reference did not disclose the claim language in our proposed amendments.

[0015] For example, Unix Unleashed fails to disclose or describe "configuring a single computer with **a single user interface display** to be concurrently and physically shared by <u>multiple users</u> by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer", while additionally "displaying on the **single user interface display** of the single computer only **one** of the remote process enabled workspace environments **as active at a time**".

[0016] Based on the discussion above, UNIX Unleashed does not anticipate all of the elements of claim 22, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

[0017] <u>Amended independent claim 29</u> recites ...

> configuring a single computer **with a single user interface display** to be concurrently and physically shared by multiple users by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer, comprising:
>
> ...
>
> displaying on the **single user interface display of the single computer only one of the remote process enabled workspace environments as active at a time**; and ...

[0018] In the rejection to the claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by UNIX Unleashed. Applicant respectfully submits that UNIX Unleashed fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim. During the above mentioned Examiner interview, the Examiner quickly and

readily agreed that the cited reference did not disclose the claim language in our proposed amendments.

[0019]   For example, Unix Unleashed fails to disclose or describe "configuring a single computer with **a single user interface display** to be concurrently and physically shared by <u>multiple users</u> by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer", while additionally "displaying on the **single user interface display** of the single computer only **one** of the remote process enabled workspace environments **as active at a time**".

[0020]   Based on the discussion above, UNIX Unleashed does not anticipate all of the elements of claim 29, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

[0021]   <u>Amended independent claim 36</u> recites an arrangement comprising:

> a single computer capable of being concurrently and physically shared by multiple users by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer, the single computer comprising:
> **a single user interface display;**
> ...
> ... **display only one of the remote process enabled workspace environments as active at a time**...

[0022]   In the rejection to the claim, the Examiner argues that the subject matter of this claim is anticipated by UNIX Unleashed. Applicant respectfully

Serial No.: 10/606,591   18
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: E. John Fain
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee&hayes   The Business of IP™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

submits that UNIX Unleashed fails to disclose or describe all of the features of this claim. During the above mentioned Examiner interview, the Examiner quickly and readily agreed that the cited reference did not disclose the claim language in our proposed amendments.

[0023]   For example, Unix Unleashed fails to disclose or describe "a *single* computer capable of being concurrently and physically shared by multiple users by executing a plurality of concurrent **switchable** remote process enabled workspace environments within the single computer... comprising: **a single user interface display**", while additionally displaying "only **one** of the remote process enabled workspace environments as **active at a time**".

[0024]   Based on the discussion above, UNIX Unleashed does not anticipate all of the elements of claim 36, and the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to this claim.

Serial No.: 10/606,591   19
Atty Docket No.: MS1-0492USC1
Atty/Agent: E. John Fain
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

lee&hayes   The Business of IP™
www.leehayes.com   509.324.9256

Obviousness Rejections

[0025]   The Examiner rejects claims 26, 27, 33, 34, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *UNIX Unleashed*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0026]   Claims 26 and 27 are dependent from independent claim 22. Claims 33 and 34 are a dependent from independent claim 29. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent from independent claim 36. The Applicant requests these rejections be withdrawn based on reasons presented above regarding anticipation rejections of independent claims 22, 29 and 36.

Dependent Claims

[0027]   In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0028]   All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.   If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**.   Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 11-8-2007   By: *E John Fain*

E. John Fain
Reg. No.60960
(509) 324-9256 x256
johnf@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com